arXiv:hep-th/9604006v1 2 Apr 1996

The Green–Schwarz Superstring in Extended Configuration Space and Infinitely Reducible First Class Constraints Problem

A.A. Deriglazov and A.V. Galajinsky*

Department of Theoretical Physics, Tomsk State University, 634050 Tomsk, Russia

Abstract

The Green–Schwarz superstring action is modified to include some set of additional (on-shell trivial) variables. A complete constraints system of the theory turns out to be reducible both in the original and in additional variable sectors. The initial $8s$ first class constraints and $8c$ second class ones are shown to be unified with $8c$ first and $8s$ second class constraints from the additional variables sector, resulting with $SO(1,9)$-covariant and linearly independent constraint sets. Residual reducibility proves to fall on second class constraints only.

PACS codes: 04.60.Ds, 11.30.Pb
Key words: covariant quantization, mixed constraints, superstring.

1 Introduction

The general recipe of covariant quantization of dynamical systems subject to reducible first and second class constraints was developed in Refs. 1–3. "Ghosts for ghosts" mechanism [1, 2] was proposed to balance correct dynamics on the one hand and manifest covariance on the another. Application of the scheme turned out to be remarkably successful for certain cases. The antisymmetric tensor field [1], chiral superparticle [4], high superspin theories [5] seem to be the most interesting examples.

However, in the general case there may arise an infinite tower of extra ghost variables, what makes the expression for effective action formal. The superparticle [6] and superstring [7] models appeared to be the first (and, actually, the most important) examples of such a kind. A complete constraints system of the theories in the Hamiltonian formalism includes fermionic constraints[1] which, being a mixture of 8 first class and 8 second class ones (**8**s and **8**c-representations of $SO(8)$-little group respectively), lie in the

*E-mail: deriglaz@phys.tsu.tomsk.su;galajin@phys.tsu.tomsk.su

[1]We discuss mostly $N = 1, D = 10$ case for that covariant quantization is the principal problem.

minimal spinor representation of the Lorentz group. The latter fact means that covariant irreducible separation of the constraints is impossible in the original phase space [8]. However, one can realize reducible split by making use of covariant projectors known for the superparticles [9–11] and superstring [12]. Introduction of 16 covariant primary ghosts to the (reducible) first class constraints implies 16 secondary ones etc. There arises an infinite tower of extra ghost variables. The Lagrangian analog of the situation is infinitely reducible Siegel symmetry [13], with spinor parameters from which only half is essential on-shell. Note that within the framework of the alternative twistor-harmonic approach [14], the fermionic constraints can be separated in covariant and irreducible manner due to the "bridge nature" of the harmonic variables. This formalism, however, is essentially Hamiltonian and the reparametrization invariance of the original Green–Schwarz theory turns out to be broken in the modified version [14].

Reformulation of the BFV-procedure which do not involve explicit separation of constraints was presented in Refs. 15–17. However, as was shown in Ref. 11, application of the scheme for concrete models may conflict with manifest Poincaré covariance.

In this paper we propose an alternative approach to the infinitely reducible constraints problem of $D = 10, N = 1$ Green–Schwarz superstring (GSS). The basic idea is to introduce additional pure gauge fermionic degrees of freedom subject to *reducible* constraints like that of the GSS. We choose these constraints to be a pair of Majorana–Weyl spinors with the following structure:[2]

(i) The first of them is a mixture of 8 first class and 8 second class constraints, which are required to lie in **8**c and **8**s irreducible representations of $SO(8)$ group, respectively.

(ii) The second spinor contains only 8 linearly-independent components being second class constraints.

Splitting further all the fermionic constraints of the problem in covariant and reducible manner (by making use of covariant projectors [11, 12]) one can combine the original fermionic first class constraints of the GSS with the first class ones from the additional variables sector into one irreducible set (what corresponds to $\bar{8}s \oplus 8c$-representation of $SO(8)$ or Majorana-Weyl spinor of $SO(1,9)$. Analogously, the second class constraints from the additional variables sector can be unified with the original second class ones resulting with covariant and irreducible constraint. For the model concerned, the resulting constraint system turns out to be completely equivalent to the initial one. Thus, the reducible fermionic first class constraints of the GSS become irreducible in the modified theory. The infinite tower of extra ghost variables, that corresponds to the first class constraints in the original formulation of the superstring, will no appear in the new version. The Lagrangian which reproduce the scheme described above is our main result.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 the Green-Schwarz action is modified to include some set of additional variables. The local symmetries of the model are investigated. A complete canonical analysis of the theory is carried out in subsec. 3.1. Classical equivalence of the modified and original superstrings is established in subsec. 3.2. We do this by imposing gauge conditions for all first class constraints in the problem. Dynamics in the physical variables sector proves to coincide with that of the GSS. Note that all the

[2]The total number of constraints is sufficient to suppress just one canonical pair of variables.

gauge conditions can be imposed in covariant manner, excepting the standard light-cone gauge conditions corresponding to the super-Virasoro constraints. In Sec. 4 explicitly covariant separation of the constraints is realized. The infinitely reducible first class constraints problem is resolved. Concluding remarks are presented in Sec. 5. Appendix A contains our conventions and a brief description of $SO(8)$-formalism used in the work. Appendix B includes essential Poisson brackets of the constraints involved.

2 Action and local symmetries

The action functional to be examined is of the form

$$S = S_{\rm GS} + S_{\rm add}, \tag{1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\rm GS} &= \int d\tau d\sigma \Big\{ -\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'}\sqrt{-g}g^{\alpha\beta}\Pi^m{}_\alpha\Pi_{m\beta} - \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha X^m i\Theta\Gamma_m\partial_\beta\Theta\Big\}, \\ S_{\rm add} &= \int d\tau d\sigma \Big\{ -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}\Lambda_m(\partial_\alpha A^m{}_\beta - \partial_\beta A^m{}_\alpha - \\ &- \partial_\alpha\Theta\Gamma^m\chi_\beta + i\partial_\beta\Theta\Gamma^m\chi_\alpha + i\chi_\alpha\Gamma^m\chi_\beta) - \Phi\Lambda^2\Big\}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\Pi^m{}_\alpha \equiv \partial_\alpha X^m - i\Theta\Gamma^m\partial_\alpha\Theta$, $\sqrt{-g} \equiv \sqrt{-\det g_{\alpha\beta}}$. The first term in Eq. (1) is the Green-Schwarz action [7], the second term is the action of additional variables. All the variables are treated on equal footing. The Latin indices are designed for target manifold tensors, the Greek ones are set for worldsheet tensors (for instance, $\chi^A{}_\alpha$ is $D = 10$ Lorentz spinor and $D = 2$ worldsheet vector). Statistics of the fields corresponds to their tensor structure, i.e., X^m, $g^{\alpha\beta}$, $A^m{}_\alpha$, Λ^m, Φ are bosons, while Θ^A, $\chi^A{}_\alpha$ are fermions. The matrix $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}$ is chosen in the form $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta} = -\epsilon^{\beta\alpha}$, $\epsilon^{01} = -1$.

Since the $S_{\rm add}$ contains only derivatives of the Θ, the modified superstring is invariant under standard global supersymmetry transformations.

Local symmetries of the theory, except the standard reparametrizations of worldsheet and the Weyl transformations, include a modification of the Siegel transformations[3]

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_k\Theta = 2i\Pi_{m\alpha}\tilde{\Gamma}^m k^{-\alpha}, \\ &\delta_k X^m = i\Theta\Gamma^m\delta_k\Theta, \\ &\delta_k(\sqrt{-g}g^{\alpha\beta}) = 16\sqrt{-g}P^{-\alpha\gamma}(\partial_\gamma\Theta k^{-\beta}), \\ &\delta_k\chi_\alpha = \partial_\alpha(\delta_k\Theta), \\ &\delta_k A^m{}_\alpha = i\Theta\Gamma^m\partial_\alpha(\delta_k\Theta), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where

$$P^{\pm\alpha\beta} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\Big(g^{\alpha\beta} \pm \frac{\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}}{\sqrt{-g}}\Big), \qquad k^- \equiv P^- k,$$

[3]To check k-invariance of the action it is necessary to use to the Fierz identity $\Gamma^m_{A(B}\Gamma^m_{CD)} = 0$ and the property of the $P^\pm$ projectors: $P^{\pm\alpha\gamma}P^{\pm\beta\sigma} = P^{\pm\beta\gamma}P^{\pm\alpha\sigma}$. Note as well that the k-symmetry is reducible. The following transformation of parameters $k'_\beta = k_\beta + \Pi_{n\gamma}\Gamma^n P^{-\gamma\sigma}\varkappa_{\sigma\beta}$, with the $\varkappa_{\sigma\beta}$ being an arbitrary function, does not change Eq. (2) (modulo equations of motion), what means linear dependence of generators of the transformations.

and a set of new symmetries acting on the additional variables subspace. Here we list them with brief comments.

There is a pair of bosonic symmetries with $D = 10$ vector ξ^m and $D = 2$ vector μ_α parameters

$$\delta_\xi A^m{}_\alpha = \partial_\alpha \xi^m, \tag{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\mu A^m{}_\alpha &= \Lambda^m \mu_\alpha, \\ \delta_\mu \Phi &= -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha \mu_\beta, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

which mean that the fields $A^m{}_\alpha$ and Φ may be gauged away. Note that the system (3), (4) is reducible. This can easily be seen by taking $\xi^m = \Lambda^m \nu$, $\mu_\beta = \partial_\beta \nu$, where ν is an arbitrary function. With such a choice $(\delta_\xi - \delta_\mu)|_{\rm on-shell} \equiv 0$, what means functional dependence of generators of the transformations. In addition to the transformations (3) and (4) the action (1) possesses the following fermionic symmetries

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{s^+}\chi_\alpha &= \Lambda_n \tilde{\Gamma}^n s^+{}_\alpha, \\ \delta_{s^+}\Phi &= \epsilon^{\alpha\beta} i(\partial_\alpha \Theta - \chi_\alpha) s^+{}_\beta, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{s^-}\chi_\alpha &= \Lambda_n \tilde{\Gamma}^n s^-{}_\alpha, \\ \delta_{s^-}\Phi &= i\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}(\partial_\alpha \Theta - \chi_\alpha) s^-{}_\beta. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The symmetries (5) and (6) are reducible. The transformation of parameters, under which Eqs. (5) and (6) are invariant (modulo equations of motion), is of the form

$$s'_\alpha = s_\alpha + \Lambda_n \Gamma^n \varkappa_\alpha$$

with an arbitrary $\varkappa_\alpha$. It is interesting to note that the reducible symmetries (2) and (6) can be replaced by one irreducible symmetry if one supposes that $(\Lambda\Pi_\alpha)^2 \neq 0$. Actually, consider the following transformation

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta_\omega \Theta = 2i\Pi_{m\alpha}\tilde{\Gamma}^m \omega^{-\alpha}, \\ &\delta_\omega X^m = i\Theta\Gamma^m \delta_\omega \Theta, \\ &\delta_\omega(\sqrt{-g}g^{\alpha\beta}) = 16\sqrt{-g}P^{-\alpha\gamma}(\partial_\gamma \Theta \omega^{-\beta}), \\ &\delta_\omega \chi_\alpha = \partial_\alpha(\delta_\omega \Theta) + \Lambda_m \tilde{\Gamma}^m \omega^-{}_\alpha, \\ &\delta_\omega A^m{}_\alpha = i\Theta\Gamma^m \partial_\alpha(\delta_\omega \Theta), \\ &\delta_\omega \Phi = i\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}(\partial_\alpha \Theta - \chi_\alpha)\omega^-{}_\beta, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

which is a formal sum of Eqs. (2) and (6) with $k^- = s^- \equiv \omega^-$. Two remarks concerning this symmetry are relevant. First, it is straightforward to check that there is no a transformation of parameters which leaves Eq. (7) invariant, i.e., all 16 parameters are effective on-shell. Secondly, the original k^- and s^- transformations (each of them has 8 essential parameters on-shell) can be extracted from Eq. (7) by taking

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{1\beta} &= \frac{1}{(\Lambda\Pi)^2}(\Lambda\Pi_\sigma)P^{+\sigma\gamma}\Lambda_n\Gamma^n\tilde{\Gamma}^m\Pi_{m\gamma}k_\beta, \\ \omega_{2\beta} &= \frac{1}{(\Lambda\Pi)^2}(\Lambda\Pi_\sigma)P^{+\sigma\gamma}\Pi_{n\gamma}\Gamma^n\tilde{\Gamma}^m\Lambda_m s_\beta. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Equations of motion for the theory (1) are of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pi^m{}_\alpha \Pi_{m\beta} = \frac{1}{2} g_{\alpha\beta} g^{\gamma\delta} \Pi^m{}_\gamma \Pi_{m\delta}, \\
&\partial_\beta(\sqrt{-g} g^{\beta\alpha} \partial_\alpha X^m + 2\sqrt{-g} P^{-\beta\alpha} i\Theta\Gamma^m \partial_\alpha \Theta) = 0, \\
&\Pi_{m\alpha} \Gamma^m P^{-\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta \Theta = 0;
\end{aligned} \tag{9.a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Lambda^2 = 0, \\
&\epsilon^{\alpha\beta}(\partial_\alpha A^m{}_\beta - \partial_\beta A^m{}_\alpha - i\partial_\alpha \Theta\Gamma^m \chi_\beta + \\
&\quad + i\partial_\beta \Theta\Gamma^m \chi_\alpha + i\chi_\alpha \Gamma^m \chi_\beta) + 4\Phi\Lambda^m = 0, \\
&\partial_\alpha \Lambda_m = 0, \\
&i(\chi_\alpha - \partial_\alpha \Theta)\Gamma^m \Lambda_m = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{9.b}$$

Note that equations (9a) are just the Green–Schwarz superstring equations. In the light-cone gauge this system reduces to $\Box X^i = 0$, $\partial_- \Theta^a = 0$, where i and a are, respectively, vector and spinor indices of $SO(8)$ group. It turns out that there are no more dynamical degrees of freedom in the question. We will prove this fact in the next section by passing to the Hamiltonian formalism and imposing all gauge conditions.

3 Canonical formalism

3.1 Dirac procedure

Denoting momenta conjugate to the variables[4] (X^m, Θ^B, N, N_1, g^{11}, Λ^m, $A^m{}_\alpha$, $\chi^B{}_\alpha$, Φ) as (π_m, $P_{\theta B}$, P_N, P_{N_1}, P_g, $\pi_{\Lambda m}$, $\pi_{Am}{}^\alpha$, $P^\alpha_{\chi B}$, π_Φ) one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
&\pi_m = \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Big(\frac{1}{N}\Pi_{m0} - \frac{N_1}{N}\Pi_{m1} + i\Theta\Gamma_m \partial_1 \Theta\Big), \\
&\tilde{L} \equiv P_\theta + i\Theta\Gamma^m\Big(\pi_m + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{m1}\Big) - i\chi_1 \Gamma^m \Lambda_m \approx 0; \\
&\pi_{\Lambda m} \approx 0, \qquad \pi_{Am}{}^0 \approx 0, \qquad \pi_{Am}{}^1 - \Lambda_m \approx 0, \\
&P_\chi{}^0 \approx 0, \qquad P_\chi{}^1 \approx 0, \qquad \pi_\Phi \approx 0, \\
&P_N \approx 0, \qquad P_{N_1} \approx 0, \qquad P_g \approx 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $\partial_1 \equiv \partial/\partial\sigma$. The first equation in Eq. (10) determines $\partial_0 X^m$ as a function of the other canonical variables. The remaining equations are primary constraints.

The canonical Hamiltonian is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
H = \int d\sigma \Big\{ &N_1(\hat{\pi}\Pi_1) + N\frac{1}{2}\Big(2\pi\alpha'\hat{\pi}^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_1{}^2\Big) - \\
&- A_0 \partial_1 \Lambda + i(\chi_1 - \partial_1 \Theta)\Gamma^m \Lambda_m \chi_0 + \Phi\Lambda^2 + \tilde{L}\lambda_\theta +
\end{aligned}$$

[4]Within the framework of canonical formalism it is useful to make an invertible change of variables [33]

$$g^{00}, g^{01}, g^{11} \to N = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{-g} g^{00}}, N_1 = -\frac{g^{01}}{g^{00}}, g^{11},$$

where $\sqrt{-g} = \sqrt{-\det g_{\alpha\beta}}$. In terms of the new variables finding of secondary constraints becomes evident.

$$+P_N\lambda_N + P_{N_1}\lambda_{N_1} + P_g\lambda_g + \pi_\Lambda\lambda_1 + \pi_A{}^0\lambda_2 +$$
$$+(\pi_A{}^1 - \Lambda)\lambda_3 + P_\chi{}^0\lambda_4 + P_\chi{}^1\lambda_5 + \pi_\Phi\lambda_6\Big\}, \tag{11}$$

where

$$\hat{\pi}^n \equiv \pi^n - \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'} i\Theta\Gamma^n\partial_1\Theta$$

and $\lambda_\theta, \lambda_N, \lambda_{N_1}, \lambda_g, \lambda_1 - \lambda_6$ are Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the primary constraints. The preservation in time of the primary constraints implies the secondary ones

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{\pi}_m\Pi^m{}_1 \approx 0, \qquad \frac{1}{2}\Big(2\pi\alpha'\hat{\pi}^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_1{}^2\Big) \approx 0, \\ &\Lambda^2 \approx 0, \qquad (\chi_1 - \partial_1\Theta)\Gamma^m\Lambda_n \approx 0, \\ &\partial_1\Lambda^m \approx 0, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

and conditions on the Lagrange multipliers

$$\lambda_1{}^m = 0, \tag{13.a}$$
$$\lambda_{3\,m} = -i\chi_1\Gamma_m\lambda_\theta + \partial_1 A_{m\,0} + i(\chi_1 - \partial_1\Theta)\Gamma_m\chi_0 + 2\Phi\pi_{A\,m}{}^1, \tag{13.b}$$
$$\pi_{Am}{}^1\Gamma^m(\lambda_\theta - \chi_0) = 0, \tag{13.c}$$
$$2i\Gamma^m\Big(\hat{\pi}_m + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{m\,1}\Big)(\lambda_\theta - (N+N_1)\partial_1\theta) -$$
$$-i\Gamma^m\pi_{Am}{}^1(\lambda_5 - \partial_1\chi_0) = 0. \tag{13.d}$$

Equations (13.c) and (13.d) are sufficient to determine λ_θ. Actually, multiplying Eq. (13.c) by $\tilde{\Gamma}^n\Big(\hat{\pi}_n + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{n\,1}\Big)$ and Eq. (13.d) by $\tilde{\Gamma}^n\pi_{An}{}^1$ and then taking the sum one gets

$$\lambda_\theta = \frac{1}{2\pi_A{}^1\Big(\hat{\pi} + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_1\Big)}\Big\{\tilde{\Gamma}^n\Big(\hat{\pi}_n + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{n\,1}\Big)\Gamma^m\pi_{Am}{}^1\chi_0 +$$
$$+\tilde{\Gamma}^m\pi_{Am}{}^1\Gamma^n\Big(\hat{\pi}_n + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{n1}\Big)(N+N_1)\partial_1\Theta\Big\} \tag{14}$$

provided that $\pi_A{}^1\Big(\hat{\pi} + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_1\Big) \neq 0$ on-shell. The latter condition can always be realized by choosing appropriate gauge fixing conditions and initial data to the equations of motion.[5] Inserting further Eq. (14) into Eq. (13.d) one finds

$$\pi_{An}{}^1\Gamma^n(\lambda_5 - \partial_1\chi_0) = 0. \tag{15}$$

Equation (15) determines half of the λ_5, that can easily be seen by passing to the $SO(8)$-formalism. In $SO(8)$-notations the condition (15) reads (see Appendix A)

$$(\lambda_{5\dot{a}} - \partial_1\chi_{0\dot{a}}) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi_A{}^{+1}}\gamma^i_{\dot{a}a}\pi_{Ai}{}^1(\lambda_{5a} - \partial_1\chi_{0a}) = 0.$$

[5]The constraints $\partial_1\pi_{An}{}^1 \approx 0$, $(\pi_A{}^1)^2 \approx 0$ together with the equation of motion $\partial_0\pi_{An}{}^1 = 0$ imply $\pi_{Am}{}^1 = n_m$, where n_m is a constant null-vector (initial data). Choosing the initial data to be $n^m = (n^0, 0, \ldots, 0, n^0)$, $n^0 \neq 0$, and imposing standard light-cone gauge conditions (see subsec. 3.2) $X^- = \alpha'\tau p^-$, $\pi^- = \frac{1}{2\pi}p^-$, where $p^- \neq 0$ is a complete momentum of the superstring, one gets

$$\pi_A{}^1\Big(\hat{\pi} + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_1\Big) = -\frac{1}{2\pi}n^+\Big(p^- - \frac{2}{\alpha'}i\theta\Gamma^-\partial_1\theta\Big) \neq 0.$$

It is straightforward to check further the primary constraints are identically conserved in time if Eqs. (12) and (13) hold. Thus, there are no more constraints in the problem.

To separate the original constraints of the theory into first and second class, consider the equivalent constraints system

$$\pi_{\Lambda n} \approx 0, \qquad \Lambda_n - \pi_{An}{}^1 \approx 0, \tag{16.a}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\pi_{An}{}^0 \approx 0, \qquad \pi_\Phi \approx 0, \\ &P_\chi{}^0 \approx 0, \qquad P_N \approx 0, \\ &P_{N_1} \approx 0, \qquad P_g \approx 0, \\ &(\pi_A{}^1)^2 \approx 0, \qquad \partial_1 \pi_{An}{}^1 \approx 0, \end{aligned} \tag{16.b}$$

$$\hat{\pi}_n \Pi^n{}_1 + L\partial_1\Theta \approx 0, \qquad \frac{1}{2}\Big(2\pi\alpha'\hat{\pi}^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_1{}^2\Big) + L\partial_1\Theta \approx 0, \tag{16.c}$$

$$L \equiv P_\theta + i\Theta\Gamma^m\Big(\pi_m + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{m1}\Big) - i\partial_1\Theta\Gamma^m\pi_{Am}{}^1 - \partial_1 P_\chi{}^1 \approx 0, \tag{16.d}$$

$$P_\chi{}^1 \approx 0, \qquad (\chi_1 - \partial_1\Theta)\Gamma^n\pi_{An}{}^1 \approx 0. \tag{16.e}$$

The constraints (16.a) are second class. The constraints system (16.b), (16.c) is first class. Among 16 fermionic constraints (16.d) half is first class and another half is second class (see Sec. 4). Analogously, the first equation in Eq. (16.e) contains 8 first class and 8 second class constraints while the latter implies 8 linearly independent second class constraints (see Sec. 4). The essential Poisson brackets of the constraints (16) are gathered in the Appendix B.

Note that among 1+10 constraints $(\pi_A{}^1)^2 \approx 0$, $\partial_1\pi_{An}{}^1 \approx 0$ only 10 are functionally independent as a consequence of the identity $\partial_1(\pi_A{}^1)^2 - 2\pi_A{}^{n1}\partial_1\pi_{An}{}^1 \equiv 0$. Independent constraints can be extracted in the light-cone basis as follows:

$$\pi_A{}^{-1} - \frac{1}{2\pi_A{}^{+1}}\pi_A{}^{i1}\pi_{Ai}{}^1 \approx 0, \qquad \partial_1\pi_A{}^{+1} \approx 0, \qquad \partial_1\pi_{Ai}{}^1 \approx 0.$$

As was mentioned above, it is impossible to separate 8 first and 8 second class constraints, being combined in the L, in covariant and irreducible manner. For the model concerned, covariant projectors into first and second class constraints are constructed in Sec. 4.

An explicit counting the degrees of freedom shows that there are 16 bosonic and 8 fermionic phase space degrees of freedom in the model that just coincides with the number of degrees of freedom in the Green–Schwarz theory. Note as well that, after use of the Dirac algorithm, there remained 1+2+10+1 bosonic and 16+8 fermionic undefined Lagrange multipliers. Since the local symmetries, considered in Sec. 2, have just this number of parameters being independent on-shell, we conclude that they exhaust all the essential Lagrangian symmetries of the model.

3.2 Gauge fixing and physical dynamics

In imposing gauge fixing conditions two criteria should be satisfied [18]. First, the Poisson bracket of original first class constraints and gauges must be an invertible matrix when restricted to constraints and gauges surface. Secondly, gauge conditions are to be consistent with equations of motion, i.e., there must no appear new constraints from condition

of preservation in time of the gauges.[6] With this remark, consider first gauge conditions fixing all the undefined Lagrange multipliers in the theory. The following equations:

$$N \approx 1, \quad N_1 \approx 0, \quad g^{11} \approx 1, \quad A^m{}_0 \approx 0, \quad \Phi \approx 1/2, \tag{17.a}$$

$$\chi_0 \approx 0, \quad (\chi_1 - \partial_1\Theta)\Gamma^n\Big(\hat{\pi}_n + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{n1}\Big) \approx 0 \tag{17.b}$$

prove to be suitable for this goal. Preservation in time of the gauges (17) yields

$$\begin{array}{lll} \lambda_N = 0, & \lambda_{N_1} = 0, & \lambda_g = 0, \\ \lambda_2{}^m = 0, & \lambda_6 = 0, & \lambda_4 = 0, \end{array} \tag{18}$$

and

$$(\lambda_5 - \partial_1\lambda_\theta)\Gamma^n\Big(\hat{\pi}_n + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{n1}\Big) + (\chi_1 - \partial_1\Theta)\Gamma^n\Big(\frac{2}{\pi\alpha'}i\partial_1\Theta\Gamma_n\lambda_\theta + \\ + \partial_1\Big(\hat{\pi}_n + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{n1}\Big)\Big) = 0. \tag{19}$$

Taking into account that the constraint $(\chi_1 - \partial_1\Theta)\Gamma^n\pi_{An}{}^1 \approx 0$ together with the gauge $(\chi_1 - \partial_1\Theta)\Gamma^n\Big(\hat{\pi}_n + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{n1}\Big) \approx 0$ imply

$$\chi_1 - \partial_1\Theta \approx 0, \tag{20}$$

while Eqs. (13.c), (15), (16.b), and (19) mean

$$\lambda_5 - \partial_1\lambda_\theta = 0 \tag{21}$$

one concludes that all the Lagrange multipliers have been fixed. In the gauge chosen, the canonical variables (N, P_N), (N_1, P_{N_1}), (g^{11}, P_g), $(A^m{}_0, \pi_{Am}{}^0)$, $(\chi_0, P_\chi{}^0)$, $(\chi_1, P_\chi{}^1)$, (Φ, π_Φ) are unphysical and may be dropped after introducing the corresponding Dirac bracket.

Consider now gauge conditions to the remaining first class constraints.

(i) (Θ, P_θ)-*sector*. There are 8 first class constraints being nontrivially combined with 8 second class ones in Eq. (16.d). In this case one can adopt the condition

$$\Gamma^n\pi_{An}{}^1\Theta \approx 0 \tag{22}$$

or in the $SO(8)$-formalism (we write out only linearly independent part of Eq. (22))

$$\Theta_{\dot{a}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}\pi_A{}^{+1}}\gamma^i_{\dot{a}a}\Theta_a\pi_{Ai}{}^1 \approx 0. \tag{23}$$

Because $\Gamma^n\pi_{An}{}^1\lambda_\theta \approx 0$ (see Eq. (14)) the gauge (22) is consistent with the equations of motion. It is straightforward to check as well that the Poisson bracket of the first class constraints being contained in the L with the gauge (23) is an invertible matrix.

After gauge fixing, the only dynamical variables in the sector are Θ_a. Taking into account that in the gauge chosen Eq. (14) takes the form

$$\lambda_\theta = \partial_1\Theta \tag{24}$$

[6] In the general case one can admit new constraints if they will further be treated as gauge conditions for some of the original first class constraints.

one concludes that physical dynamics of the superstring (1) in the odd-variables sector is described by

$$\partial_0\Theta_a = \partial_1\Theta_a$$

or

$$\partial_-\Theta_a = 0, \qquad a = 1, \ldots, 8, \tag{25}$$

just as in the Green-Schwarz model.

(ii) $(A^m{}_1, \pi_{Am}{}^1)$-*sector*. The constraints to be discussed are of the form

$$(\pi_A{}^1)^2 \approx 0, \qquad \partial_1\pi_A{}^{m1} \approx 0. \tag{26}$$

The equations of motion in the sector read

$$\partial_0\tilde{A}^m_1 = 0, \qquad \partial_0\tilde{\pi}_A{}^{m1} = 0, \tag{27}$$

where canonical transformation

$$A^m{}_1 \to \tilde{A}^m_1 = A^m{}_1 - \tau\pi_A{}^{m1}, \qquad \pi_A{}^{m1} \to \tilde{\pi}^{m1}_A = \pi_A{}^{m1}$$

has been made. Imposing then the following gauge condition to Eq. (26)

$$\tilde{A}^m{}_1 \approx 0$$

one concludes that there are no physical degrees of freedom in the sector.

(iii) (X^m, π_m)-*sector*. There are super-Virasoro constraints (16.c) and equations of motion

$$\partial_0 X^m = 2\pi\alpha'\pi^m, \qquad \partial_0\pi^m = \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\partial_1\partial_1 X^m. \tag{28}$$

In this case one can impose the standard light-cone gauges [19]

$$X^- = \alpha'\tau p^-, \qquad \pi^- = \frac{1}{2\pi}p^- \tag{29}$$

where p^- is the complete momentum of the superstring. It is easy to check that the conditions (29) are consistent with Eq. (28). Making use of Eq. (16.c) to express the variables X^+ and π^+ as functions of other variables and taking into account the gauges (29) one can conclude that the physical dynamics in the sector is described by

$$\partial_0 X^i = 2\pi\alpha'\pi^i, \qquad \partial_0\pi^i = \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\partial_1\partial_1 X^i \tag{30}$$

or eliminating the π^i

$$\Box X^i = 0, \qquad i = 1, \ldots, 8. \tag{31}$$

Thus, physical dynamics of the superstring (1) is determined by Eqs. (25) and (31), what just coincides with the Green-Schwarz superstring dynamics.

4 Covariant separation of constraints. Resolving the infinitely reducible first class constraints problem

In the previous sections we have modified the GSS so as to include a set of additional pure gauge variables. In the extended phase space covariant separation of constraints present no a special problem. Actually, consider the following constraints system:

$$\pi_{An}{}^{1}\tilde{\Gamma}^{n}P_{\chi}{}^{1} \approx 0, \tag{32.a}$$
$$b_{n}\tilde{\Gamma}^{n}P_{\chi}{}^{1} \approx 0, \quad (\chi_{1} - \partial_{1}\Theta)\Gamma^{n}\pi_{An}{}^{1} \approx 0, \tag{32.b}$$
$$b_{n}\tilde{\Gamma}^{n}L \approx 0, \tag{32.c}$$
$$\pi_{An}{}^{1}\tilde{\Gamma}^{n}L \approx 0, \tag{32.d}$$

where $b^{n} \equiv \hat{\pi}^{n} + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi^{n}{}_{1}$, that is completely equivalent to Eqs. (16.e) and (16.d) due to the condition $(b\pi_{A}{}^{1}) \neq 0$ (see subsec. 3.1). Passing to the $SO(8)$-formalism it is straightforward to check now that Eq. (32.a) includes 8 linearly independent first class constraints; Eq. (32.b) contains 8+8 independent second class ones; Eqs. (32.c) and (32.d) imply 8 first class and 8 second class constraints, respectively. For instance, rewriting Eqs. (32.a) and (32.b) into $SO(8)$ formalism one gets (see Appendix A)

$$\nu_{a} \equiv \sqrt{2}\pi_{A}{}^{+1}P_{\chi a}{}^{1} + \pi_{Ai}{}^{1}\gamma^{i}{}_{a\dot{a}}P_{\chi\dot{a}}{}^{1} \approx 0, \tag{33.a}$$
$$\varphi_{\dot{a}} \equiv \sqrt{2}b^{-}P_{\chi\dot{a}}{}^{1} + b_{i}\gamma^{i}{}_{\dot{a}a}P_{\chi a}{}^{1} \approx 0, \tag{33.b}$$
$$\psi_{\dot{a}} \equiv \sqrt{2}\pi_{A}{}^{+1}(\chi_{1\dot{a}} - \partial_{1}\Theta_{\dot{a}}) - (\chi_{1a} - \partial_{1}\Theta_{a})\gamma^{i}{}_{a\dot{a}}\pi_{Ai}{}^{1} \approx 0. \tag{33.c}$$

Evaluating then the Poisson brackets of the constraints

$$\{\varphi_{\dot{a}}, \psi_{\dot{b}}\} \approx 2b^{-}\pi_{A}{}^{+1}\Big(\delta_{\dot{a}\dot{b}} - \frac{1}{2b^{-}\pi_{A}{}^{+1}}b_{i}\gamma^{i}_{\dot{a}c}\gamma^{j}_{c\dot{b}}\pi_{Aj}{}^{1}\Big) \equiv \Delta_{\dot{a}\dot{b}}, \tag{34}$$

(all other brackets vanish[7]), and taking into account that the matrix in the right hand side of Eq. (34) is invertible

$$\Delta\tilde{\Delta} = 1, \qquad \tilde{\Delta}_{\dot{a}\dot{b}} = -\frac{1}{2(b\pi_{A}{}^{1})}\Big(\delta_{\dot{a}\dot{b}} - \frac{1}{2b^{-}\pi_{A}{}^{+1}}\pi_{Ai}{}^{1}\gamma^{i}_{\dot{a}c}\gamma^{j}_{c\dot{b}}b_{j}\Big) \tag{35}$$

one concludes that the constraint ν_{a} is first class, while $\varphi_{\dot{a}}$ and $\psi_{\dot{b}}$ are second class. Analogous calculations can be performed for the constraints (32.c) and (32.d). Thus, the constraint system (16.a)–(16.e) can be covariantly splitted into first and second class.

Let us now discuss Eqs. (32). The remarkable observation is that the reducible first class constraints (32.a), (32.c) (reducible second class constraints (32.d) and the first equation in Eq. (32.b)) can be combined to form irreducible constraints set. Actually, consider the constraints system

$$\pi_{An}{}^{1}\tilde{\Gamma}^{n}P_{\chi}{}^{1} + b_{n}\tilde{\Gamma}^{n}L \approx 0, \tag{36.a}$$
$$b_{n}\tilde{\Gamma}^{n}P_{\chi}{}^{1} + \pi_{An}{}^{1}\tilde{\Gamma}^{n}L \approx 0, \tag{36.b}$$
$$(\chi_{1} - \partial_{1}\Theta)\Gamma^{n}\pi_{An}{}^{1} \approx 0, \tag{36.c}$$

[7]Note that the constraints $\nu_{a} \approx 0$ and $\varphi_{\dot{a}} \approx 0$ are equivalent to $P_{\chi a}{}^{1} \approx 0$, $P_{\chi\dot{a}}{}^{1} \approx 0$ due to Eq. (35).

which is completely equivalent to the original one (Eqs. (16.d) and (16.e)) due to the constraints $b^2 \approx 0$, $(\pi_A{}^1)^2 \approx 0$. The constraints (36.a) are first class and linearly independent. Analogously, the constraints (36.b) are second class and irreducible. The remaining constraints (36.c) are second class and reducible.

Thus, in the modified version (1) of the superstring, the fermionic first class constraints form irreducible set. They will require only 16 covariant ghost variables (and 16 conjugate momenta) in constructing the BRST-charge. The infinite tower of extra ghost variables, that appeared for the GSS, will no arise in the modified model (the remaining reducible first class constraints $(\pi_A{}^1)^2 \approx 0$, $\partial_1 \pi_{An}{}^1 \approx 0$ are first stage of reducibility and can be taken into account along the standard lines [1–3]).

Note that the operators extracting the first and second class constraints from the initial mixed constraints system are not strict projectors. For instance, $\Gamma^n b_n \tilde{\Gamma}^m b_m = b^2 \approx 0$. In certain cases [11], however, it is more convenient to deal with the first and second class constraints which were extracted by means of strict projectors. For the model concerned the suitable projectors are of the form

$$P^{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm K), \qquad K = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{(b\pi_A{}^1)^2 - b^2(\pi_A{}^1)^2}} \tilde{\Gamma}^{[n}\Gamma^{m]} b_n \pi_{Am}{}^1. \tag{37}$$

In terms of the operators covariant (redundant) split of the constraints looks as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &L^- \approx 0, \qquad P_\chi{}^{+1} \approx 0 \qquad - \text{ first class,} \\ &L^+ \approx 0, \qquad P_\chi{}^{-1} \approx 0 \qquad - \text{ second class,} \end{aligned}$$

where $L^{\pm} \equiv LP^{\pm}$, $P_\chi{}^{\pm 1} \equiv P_\chi{}^1 P^{\pm}$. Generalization of Eqs. (36.a)–(36.c) reads

$$\begin{aligned} &L^- + P_\chi{}^{+1} \approx 0, \\ &L^+ + P_\chi{}^{-1} \approx 0, \\ &(\chi_1 - \partial_1 \Theta)\Gamma^n \pi_{An}{}^1 \approx 0. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

5 Final remarks

In this work the infinitely reducible first class constraints problem of the original GSS has been resolved. However, there still remains (infinitely) reducible second class constraints in the question. As is known, within the framework of the standard BFV-formalism first and second class constraints are treated in different manner. First class constraints contribute to the BRST-charge while second class ones appear in the path integral measure [3, 20]. In this sense, the problem of covariant quantization of the GSS reduces to constructing a correct integral measure for the theory (1). The weak Dirac bracket construction [11] appears to be suitable for this goal and this work is in progress now.

Note as well that the proposed techniques can be directly applied to modification of the superparticle (and superstring) due to Siegel [21, 22]. In that case, there are only 8 linearly independent fermionic first class constraints in the initial formulation, and use of the scheme will lead to the system with all fermionic constraints being irreducible. After this, covariant quantization is straightforward and the results will be present elsewhere.

Appendix A

In this paper we use generalized notations in which two inequivalent minimal spinor representations of the Lorentz group (right-handed and left-handed Majorana–Weyl spinors) are distinguished by position of its indices. We set lower index for the right-handed spinor ψ_A, $(A = 1, \ldots, 16)$ and upper index for the left-handed one ψ^A. The generalized 16×16 Dirac matrices are real, symmetric, obeying the standard algebra

$$\Gamma^m \tilde{\Gamma}^n + \Gamma^n \tilde{\Gamma}^m = 2\eta^{mn}, \qquad \eta^{nm} = \mathrm{diag}\,(-, +, \ldots). \tag{A.1}$$

In analyzing the constraint systems of the superparticle, superstring models it is useful to represent a Majorana–Weyl spinor of $SO(1,9)$-group as a Majorana one of $SO(8)$-group

$$\Psi_A = (\psi_a, \bar{\psi}_{\dot{a}}), \qquad a, \dot{a} = 1, \ldots, 8, \tag{A.2}$$

where indices $a, \dot{a}$ label two inequivalent minimal spinor representations of $SO(8)$ group (8c- and 8s-representations, respectively). This correspondence becomes evident in the following basis of the Γ-matrices

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma^0 &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_8 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathbf{1}_8 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\Gamma}^0 = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{1}_8 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{1}_8 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Gamma^i &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma^i_{a\dot{a}} \\ \gamma^i_{\dot{a}a} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\Gamma}^i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma^i_{a\dot{a}} \\ \gamma^i_{\dot{a}a} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\Gamma^9 &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_8 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{1}_8 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\Gamma}^9 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_8 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathbf{1}_8 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{A.3}$$

where the $\gamma^i_{a\dot{a}}, \gamma^i_{\dot{a}a} \equiv (\gamma^i_{a\dot{a}})^T$ are $SO(8)$ γ-matrices [19]

$$\gamma^i_{a\dot{a}}\gamma^j_{\dot{a}b} + \gamma^j_{a\dot{a}}\gamma^i_{\dot{a}b} = 2\delta^{ij}\delta_{ab}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, 8. \tag{A.4}$$

Let now b^n be a light-like vector

$$-2b^+b^- + b^i b_i = b^2 = 0. \tag{A.5}$$

The useful observation is that under the assumption (A.5) the equation

$$b_n(\tilde{\Gamma}^n\psi)^A = 0 \tag{A.6}$$

determines only 8-linearly independent conditions.

Actually, rewriting Eq. (A.6) in the $SO(8)$ formalism one gets

$$\sqrt{2}b^+\psi_a + b_i\gamma^i_{a\dot{a}}\bar{\psi}_{\dot{a}} = 0, \tag{A.7a}$$

$$\sqrt{2}b^-\bar{\psi}_{\dot{a}} + b_i\gamma^i_{\dot{a}a}\psi_a = 0, \tag{A.7b}$$

By virtue of Eqs. (A.4) and (A.5), the Eq. (A.7b) is a consequence of Eq. (A.7a), provided that the standard light-cone assumption $b^+ \neq 0$ has been made.

Appendix B

In this Appendix we list the essential Poisson brackets of the constraints (16.a)–(16.e):

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\{L_A, L_B\} = 2i\Gamma^n_{AB}\Big(\hat\pi_n + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{n1}\Big)\delta(\sigma-\sigma');\\
&\{L_A, \hat\pi\Pi_1\} = -2i(\Gamma^n\partial_1\Theta)_A\Big(\hat\pi_n + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{n1}\Big)\delta(\sigma-\sigma');\\
&\Big\{L_A, \frac{1}{2}\Big(2\pi\alpha'\hat\pi^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}{\Pi_1}^2\Big)\Big\} =\\
&\qquad = -2i(\Gamma^n\partial_1\Theta)_A\Big(\hat\pi_n + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\Pi_{n1}\Big)\delta(\sigma-\sigma');\\
&\{\hat\pi\Pi_1, \hat\pi\Pi_1\} = 2\hat\pi\Pi_1(\sigma)\partial_\sigma\delta + \partial_1(\hat\pi\Pi_1)\delta;\\
&\Big\{\hat\pi\Pi_1, \frac{1}{2}\Big(2\pi\alpha'\hat\pi^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}{\Pi_1}^2\Big)\Big\} = \Big(2\pi\alpha'\hat\pi^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}{\Pi_1}^2(\sigma)\partial_\sigma\delta +\\
&\qquad +\partial_1\Big(\frac{1}{2}\Big(2\pi\alpha'\hat\pi^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}{\Pi_1}^2\Big)\Big)\delta;\\
&\Big\{\frac{1}{2}\Big(2\pi\alpha'\hat\pi^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}{\Pi_1}^2\Big), \frac{1}{2}\Big(2\pi\alpha'\hat\pi^2 + \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}{\Pi_1}^2\Big)\Big\} =\\
&\qquad = 2(\hat\pi\Pi_1)(\sigma)\partial_\sigma\delta + \partial_1(\hat\pi\Pi_1)\delta.
\end{aligned}
\tag{B.1}
$$

In obtaining Eq. (B.1) the Fierz identity

$$
(\Gamma^n\psi)_A(\Gamma_n\varphi)_B + (\Gamma^n\psi)_B(\Gamma_n\varphi)_A = \Gamma^n_{AB}(\varphi\Gamma_n\psi) \tag{B.2}
$$

and the standard properties of the δ-function

$$
\begin{aligned}
\partial_\sigma\delta &= -\partial_{\sigma'}\delta,\\
F(\sigma')\partial_\sigma\delta &= \partial_\sigma F(\sigma)\delta + F(\sigma)\partial_\sigma\delta
\end{aligned}
\tag{B.3}
$$

have been used.

References

[1] I.A. Batalin and G.A. Vilkovisky, Phys. Lett. B **120** (1983) 166.

[2] I.A. Batalin and E.S. Fradkin, Phys. Lett. B **122** (1983) 157; Preprint P.N. Lebedev Inst. No 259 (1982).

[3] I.A. Batalin and E.S. Fradkin, Preprint P.N. Lebedev Inst. No 165 (1983).

[4] A.A. Deriglazov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **8** (1993) 1093.

[5] I.L. Buchbinder, S.M. Kuzenko, and A.G. Sibiryakov, Phys. Lett. B **352** (1995) 29.

[6] L. Brink and J. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. B **100** (1981) 310.

[7] M. Green and J. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. B **136** (1984) 367.

[8] I. Bengtsson and M. Cederwall, Göteborg preprint 84-21 (1984).

[9] J.M. Evans, Nucl. Phys. B **331** (1990) 711.

[10] L. Brink, M. Henneaux, and C. Teitelboim, Nucl. Phys. B **293** (1987) 505.

[11] A.A. Deriglazov, A.V. Galajinsky, and S.L. Lyakhovich, Preprint hep-th 9512036, submitted to Nucl. Phys. B.

[12] J.M. Evans, Phys. Lett. B **233** (1989) 307.

[13] W. Siegel, Phys. Lett. B **128** (1983) 397.

[14] E. Nissimov, S. Pacheva, and S. Solomon, Nucl. Phys. B **297** (1988) 349; B **317** (1989) 344.

[15] I.A. Batalin and I.V. Tyutin, Nucl. Phys. B **381** (1992) 619.

[16] I.A. Batalin and I.V. Tyutin, Phys. Lett. B **317** (1993) 354.

[17] I.A. Batalin and I.V. Tyutin, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **8** (1993) 3757.

[18] P.A.M. Dirac, *Lectures on quantum mechanics*, Yeshiva University, Belfer Graduate School of Science (Academic Press, New York, 1964).

[19] M.B. Green, J.H. Schwarz, and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).

[20] E.S. Fradkin and T.E. Fradkina, Phys. Lett. B **72** (1978) 343.

[21] W. Siegel, Class. Quant. Grav. **2** (1985) 95.

[22] W. Siegel, Nucl. Phys. B **263** (1985) 93.

[23] L. Brink and M. Henneaux, *Principles of String Theory* (Plenum Press, New York and London, 1988).

[24] D.M. Gitman and I.V. Tyutin, Class. Quant. Grav. **7** (1990) 2131.